

REMARKS

Claims 1-29 were pending in the present application. Claims 1, 18-21, 26, and 27 are canceled by this amendment, and claims 2-17 have been amended in order to correct typographical mistakes. No new matter has been added. All claims are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under U.S.C. § 112

Claims 2 and 9 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 2 has been rejected as unclear for including the limitation for determining properties as “mappings between measurement and property spaces.” The phrase “mapping between measurement and property spaces” is used to describe a relation or mapping between the measurement and model responses. This mapping is described in the Specification section of the present application on page 9, line 26 to page 10, line 5, and on page 13, lines 7-23. However, to further the prosecution of this application, Claim 2 has been amended and no longer recites “mappings between measurement and property spaces.” The rejection of Claim 2 is moot in view of the amendment and should be withdrawn.

Claim 9 has been rejected as unclear for including a limitation of “substantially nonconducting media.” To further the prosecution of this application, the phrase “substantially nonconducting media” has been replaced with a reference to a “semi-insulating material.” The semi-insulating materials are discussed in the Specification section of the present application on page 12, lines 22-24 and page 16, line 28 through page 17, line 2. The rejection of Claim 9 is moot in view of this amendment and should be withdrawn.

Claims 1-17 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. This rejection is respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Claim 1 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 as being indefinite for reciting a limitation of “defining operating point parameters” such that it was unclear which operating point parameters were being referred to. Claim 1 is canceled by this amendment. Claims 2 and 4 have been rewritten in the independent form and incorporate the limitations of Claim 1 with the

modified language of “defining operating point parameters for the material properties” to further clarify and point out what the applicant regards as the invention. Therefore, this rejection is moot and should be withdrawn.

Claims 2-17 have been amended to comply with the Examiner’s suggestions and to correct lack of antecedent matter basis and typographical mistakes. No new matter has been added. All claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 3, 6-8, 10, 15, 16, 18-21, 26 and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,453,689 to Goldfine *et al.* in view of Zaretsky *et al.*, “Continuum Properties from Interdigital Electrode Dielectrometry.” This rejection is respectfully traversed. However, to further the prosecution of this application, Applicants are cancelling Claims 1, 26, and 27 by this amendment. Claims 3, 6-8, 10, 15, and 16 have been amended to depend on Claim 2, which has been rewritten in the independent form, incorporating limitations of Claim 1. Claims 18-21 have been canceled. All claims are now believed to be in condition for allowance.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By 
James M. Smith
Registration No. 28,043
Telephone: (978) 341-0036
Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated:

11/16/73